

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The office action dated October 7, 2003 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claim 6 is hereby amended. Claims 32-35 are hereby added. Therefore, claims 1-35 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,790,638 to Bertacchi (hereinafter "Bertacchi"). The rejection of claims 1-31 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1- 5 are allowable over the cited references in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements including, for example, "sending an initial address message having a redirection counter set to a maximum allowed value; receiving a response message in response to the initial address message; and analyzing the response message to determine if the call has been forwarded." The teaching of Bertacchi are fundamentally different from the recited claim. That is, Bertacchi teaches prohibiting call transferring a call by analyzing a counter that is sent with or within the call and then prohibiting call transferring if the counter exceeds a preset threshold. Claim 1 of the present application recites different steps than those disclosed by Bertacchi. That is, as set forth in the present application, a redirection counter within an initial address message is purposefully set to be a maximum allowed value and such initial address message is sent. Then, a message received in response to the initial address message with the purposefully set redirection counter is analyzed to determine if a call has been

forwarded. As such, Bertacchi fails to teach or suggest any of the steps recited by claim 1 of the present application. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and claims 2-5, which depend from claim 1, are allowable over the cited references.

By this amendment, the subject matter claim 1, which is allowable, is incorporated into claim 6. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claim 6, and requests reconsideration. Amended claim 6 is allowable over the Bertacchi in that the claim recites "sending a second initial address message having a redirection counter set to a second predetermined value, wherein the sending of the second message is performed if it is undetermined whether the call has been forwarded as a result of the analyzing step." Nothing in the reference teaches at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 6, and claims 7 and 32-35, which depend from claim 6, are allowable over the cited reference.

The rejection of independent claim 8 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Independent claim 8 is allowable over Bertacchi in that the claim recites "preventing the call from being completed," and "initiating fraud prevention activity." Nothing in the reference, Bertacchi, teaches or suggests initiating fraud prevention activity. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 8, and claims 9-13, which depend from claim 8, are allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of independent claim 14 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Independent claim 14 is allowable over Bertacchi in that the claim recites "responsive to a determination that the call is a forwarded call, initiating fraud prevention activity." Nothing in the reference, Bertacchi, teaches or suggests initiating fraud prevention

activity. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 14, and claims 15-19, which depend from claim 14, are allowable over the cited references.

Applicant submits that independent claim 20 is allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to independent claim 1. That is, claims 20-23 are allowable over the cited references in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements including, for example, "sending an initial address message having a redirection counter set to a maximum allowed value; receiving a response message in response to the initial address message; and analyzing the response message to determine if the call has been forwarded." The teaching of Bertacchi are fundamentally different from the recited claim. That is, Bertacchi teaches prohibiting call transferring a call by analyzing a counter that is sent with or within the call and then prohibiting call transferring if the counter exceeds a preset threshold. Claim 20 of the present application recites different steps than those disclosed by Bertacchi. That is, as set forth in the present application, a redirection counter within an initial address message is purposefully set to be a maximum allowed value and a message received in response to the initial address message with the purposefully set redirection counter is analyzed to determine if a call has been forwarded. As such, Bertacchi fails to teach or suggest any of the steps recited by claim 20 of the present application. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 20 and claims 22-23, which depend from claim 20, are allowable over the cited references.

Applicant submits that independent claim 24 is allowable over Bertacchi. That is, claims 24-31 are allowable over the cited references in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements including, for example, "generating an initial address message . . . having a redirection counter set to a predetermined value; attempting to increment a value of the redirection counter when a switch attempts to forward the call to a second telephone number


associated with a respective telephone station, wherein the second telephone number is not a dialed telephone number." Among other features previously discussed, Bertacchi fails to teach or suggest attempting to increment a value of a redirection counter. As such, Bertacchi fails to teach or suggest any of the steps recited by claim 24 of the present application. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 24 and claims 25-31, which depend from claim 24, are allowable over the cited references.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If the Examiner deems that a telephone conversation would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (202) 496-7500.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: February 9, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Rebecca Goldman Rudich  
Registration No.: 41,786  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500